RECEIVED
APR 0 1 2007
BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS DEPARTMENT

School Panel Review Report
Grover Cleveland Middle School
Boston Public Schools

Introduction

The purpose of the School Panel Review Process is to assist the Commissioner of Education in determining whether State intervention is needed to guide improvement efforts in schools where students' MCAS performance is not at a level that reaches the school's Adequate Yearly Progress targets in English language arts or mathematics or both. The Grover Cleveland Middle School met these criteria and was one of sixteen schools selected for panel review in winter, 2004. The panel review was conducted on February 23-24, 2004.

The review panel's charge was to analyze data and written information on the school's performance and improvement efforts, visit the school, and meet with school and district officials in order to advise the Commissioner on the answers to the following two key questions:

1. Does the school have a sound plan for improving student performance?
2. Are the conditions in place for the successful implementation of the school's improvement plan(s)?

The panel's responses to the two key questions that defined the scope of its review are included in this report. These findings and conclusions are the product of the panel's analysis, discussion, and observation, based on the evidence available to it. A list of panel members who participated in the review is provided in Appendix A. A detailed schedule of the panel's activities is provided in Appendix B.

The panel's findings and conclusions on the two key questions will be forwarded to the Commissioner of Education for consideration, together with school performance data, in determining whether Grover Cleveland Middle School is deemed under-performing. The panel was not asked to formulate a sound plan for school improvement where such a plan does not presently exist or to recommend a course of action to create the conditions for successful implementation of sound improvement strategies where such conditions at present do not appear to exist. Diagnostic and/or prescriptive intervention, where needed to assist an under-performing school, occurs at the next stage of the school review process.

Grover Cleveland Middle School Profile

Enrollment

GOV DOCS
LA
306
.B7M354
2004x

The Cleveland School is one of 20 middle schools in Boston serving students in grade 6 through 8. The demographic profile at the school remained steady over the last four years: 70 percent Black, 20 percent Hispanic, five percent White, four percent Asian, and one percent Native American. Between 2001 and 2003 nearly 80 percent of the Cleveland School's total student population was low-income. About 25 percent of students enrolled during this period were non-native English speakers. The proportion of Limited English Proficient students enrolled during

the four-year period varied between three to 13 percent. This year, 29 percent students enrolled are reported to be receiving special education services. This proportion is consistent with last year's.

In 2003, the Cleveland school registered an attendance rate 89.8 percent that was below the state's 92 percent. Students were absent on average 15 days that year. The school's 18.9 percent out-of-school suspension rate was over three times higher than the state's 6.1 average. Seven percent of students were retained in 2003.

Staffing

This school year, Cleveland school officials reported having a staff of 66 that includes one administrator, one guidance counselor, one long-term substitute, one specialist, two curriculum facilitators, 11 teacher aides, and 50 teachers. Forty percent of the teachers have been at the school for fewer than five years. With the exception of one, all teachers at the Cleveland School are certified.

MCAS Overview

Students at the Cleveland School are assessed in English language arts (ELA) in grade 7, and in mathematics in grades 6 and 8. In 2003, the school failed to make AYP in ELA in the aggregate and for all qualifying subgroups. [1] In the last five years, the school made AYP twice. In mathematics, the school also failed to make AYP in the aggregate and for all subgroups. In the last five years, the Cleveland School has not made AYP. Forty percent of the staff has been at the school for fewer than five years.

Student Performance in English Language Arts

Regular Education

The performance of regular education students in ELA has not been consistent since the test was first administered in 2001. In the first administration, 16 percent of students were proficient, 48 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 36 percent at Warning. In 2002, the proportion of proficient and advanced students rose to 47 percent. Forty two percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and the percentage of those at Warning decreased to 12 percent. Last year, 25 percent of students were proficient, 65 percent were in need of improvement, and 11 percent scored at the Warning level.

[1] In accordance with the federal No Child Left Behind Act passed in 2001, student performance is disaggregated by the following subgroups: Limited English Proficient, Special Education, Free/Reduced Lunch, African-American/Black, Asian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic, Native American, and White. A minimum of 20 students per subgroup is required to issue a statistically sound rating or determination of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). In 2003 the qualifying subgroups in ELA at the Cleveland School were: Special Education, Hispanic, Free/Reduced priced lunch, and African American/Black. In mathematics, they were: Free/Reduced Lunch, and Free/Reduced priced lunch.

Special Education

Since 2001, the performance of special education students has shown some improvement in ELA. In 2001, 33 percent of students scored at the Needs Improvement level, and the remaining 67 percent at Warning. The following year, seven percent were proficient, 56 percent were in need of improvement, and 37 percent performed in the Warning category. In 2003, six percent performed in the Proficient category, 49 percent in Needs Improvement, and 44 percent in Warning.

Limited English Proficient

In 2001 and 2002, fewer than 10 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students were assessed in ELA. In 2003, 54 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level and 46 percent at Warning.

Student Performance in Mathematics

GRADE 6

Regular Education

The performance of regular education students at the grade 6 level in mathematics has shown improvement. When the test was first administered in 2001, 7 percent of students were proficient and advanced; 27 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 65% at Warning. The next year, 10 percent of students were proficient and advanced, 26 percent were in need of improvement, and 63% performed at Warning. In 2003, the proportion of proficient and advanced was 11 percent. Forty-eight percent scored at the Needs Improvement level, and the percentage of those who scored at Warning was 41 percent.

Special Education

In the last three years, the performance of special education students has been marked by high percentages of students performing at the Warning level (over 90 percent). Except for 2001 when one percent of students reached proficiency, none have been proficient in mathematics.

Limited English Proficient

Fewer than 10 LEP students were assessed in grade 6 between 2001 and 2003.

GRADE 8

Regular Education

In 2003, student performance in mathematics at grade eight showed a decrease in the percent of regular education students scoring at the Warning level, from 74% in 2002 to 52% in 2003. The proportion of proficient students rose to eight percent, while those in need of improvement increased to 39 percent.

In 2000, two percent of students were proficient, 14 percent performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 83 percent at Warning. The following year, four percent were proficient, a quarter were in need of improvement, and the proportion of those performing at the Warning level fell to 71 percent. In 2002, five percent of students were proficient and advanced, 22 percent scored in the Needs Improvement category, and 74 percent were in the Warning category.

Special Education

The performance of special education students in grade 8 mathematics has seen little improvement in the last four years. In 2000, all students performed at Warning. The next year, all but three percent performed at Warning. None were proficient. In 2002, three percent of special education students performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 97 percent at Warning. Last year, 13 percent were in need of improvement, while the majority of scores (87 percent) were in the Warning category.

Limited English Proficient

In 2000, 2002, and 2003, fewer than 10 LEP students were assessed in grade 8 in mathematics. In 2001, 22 percent of LEP students assessed performed at the Needs Improvement level, and 78 percent at Warning.

PANEL RESPONSES TO THE KEY QUESTIONS

KEY QUESTION 1: DOES THE SCHOOL HAVE A SOUND PLAN FOR IMPROVING STUDENT PERFORMANCE?

No. Although the Grover Cleveland Middle School has analyzed student performance results for MCAS, Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI), and district mid-year formative writing assessments, identified several broad areas of student weakness for math and ELA, and attempted to identify the causes for those weaknesses, the causal analysis in many cases does not extend beyond a restatement of student weaknesses or curricular shortcomings. As a result, the four student learning objectives and priorities are broad, and the logical links between causes for student weaknesses and the strategies outlined to address them is not always apparent. In addition, while the school has developed a set of "Implementation Benchmarks" as an addendum

to the plan, no clear timelines or lines of responsibility for the process of monitoring the implementation of the planned strategies for each area across clusters and classrooms is included.

A. Has the school analyzed appropriate data and program information to accurately identify the gaps in student performance and determined why those gaps exist?

Yes. Personnel at Grover Cleveland Middle School considered several student achievement measures and program information to identify broad gaps in math and ELA skills across the school. The reasons for the gaps are inadequate, generally restating the student learning gaps rather than probing more deeply into specific causes for the deficiencies.

Staff at the Grover Cleveland Middle School analyzed MCAS results for grades 6, 7 and 8 and has considered Scholastic Reading Inventory results and mid-year writing prompts as part of the process of identifying student learning gaps. The participating staff members examined the results for all students as well as for special education students and those assigned to the LA/B cluster (Learning/ Adaptive Behavior). There was no examination of other cluster groups or grade level subgroups beyond these classifications. Based on its analyses of student data, GCMS recognized that students did poorly across each strand of the curriculum frameworks. In mathematics, for example, where, on the 2003 MCAS test, 57 percent of grade six and 62 percent of grade eight students scored in the Warning category, the school also noted that 86 percent of the short answer questions were left blank. The results of the analysis led the school to identify student learning needs in broad, general terms parallel to the learning standards in the curriculum frameworks.

As gaps in student learning in English language arts, the Cleveland Whole School Improvement Plan (WSIP) lists problems with open response questions, clearly evident from the data, yet offers no further indication of why those test items were challenging to students. The plan also lists problems with elements of fiction and non-fiction, evident from the MCAS item analysis, but offers reasons for those problems as an absence of "specific strategies" to enable students to express their responses to writing. However, the instructional strategy in place at the school, Writer's Workshop, is designed to offer abundant opportunities to respond to literature. The school has not yet examined the full range of possibilities that might connect student weaknesses in ELA with the specific aspects of the instructional program or with prior learning that might be reasons for the existence of those learning gaps.

In mathematics, the improvement planning team at Grover Cleveland identified problems with algebraic reasoning and completion of short answer and multiple choice items as weaknesses in student learning, again building on their item analysis of MCAS results. As one if its reasons for why this gap exists, the school suggests that "instruction must be designed to make students reflective problem solvers." While gaps in instruction are likely reasons for student learning weaknesses, the plan offers no evidence to support the claim implied in its plan that instruction is currently inadequate. A more complete analysis of instructional survey information would provide a clearer link between the teaching practices in use at the school and the patterns of student achievement evident in the MCAS data. As presently constructed, the Cleveland WSIP does not provide a deep analysis of current programs and practices in mathematics to allow them to make a close connections between student learning gaps and the reasons for those gaps. For

example, the school recognized that its existing math curriculum, the Connected Mathematics Program (CMP), does not address algebraic thinking before grade six, although algebraice concepts are tested on the grade six MCAS. This misalignment between the academic program and the test are likely to be factors contributing to poor student performance; however, the discussion of this issue is cursory in the Cleveland WSIP.

Overall, the Cleveland WSIP is founded on an analysis of a variety of student performance information, somewhat disaggregated to identify challenges for specific student subgroups. The plan's determination of the reasons for those gaps in student learning, however, are less fully developed and are often expressed as restatements of the student learning problems.

B. Does the plan set out specific improvement objectives that are grounded in the school's analysis of the reasons for poor student performance?

No. The Cleveland WSIP includes a listing of student learning gaps based on its data analysis but, because of weaknesses in its determination of the reasons for student poor performance, the plan does not specify improvement objectives that target the core instructional issues that are contributing to unsatisfactory student achievement.

The 2003-04 Grover Cleveland Middle School WSIP includes a summary of the school's data analysis, a listing of root causes in math and ELA and an action plan that describes weaknesses to be addressed. As noted in the response to question A, the causes listed in the plan are broad and general, and are expressed as restatements of the student learning gap. The improvement objectives derived from the causes for student learning are similarly broad and general, making them difficult to measure. In ELA, one of the objective/ priorities proposes to "build on the writing skills of students with a focus on adequate development of topic and conventions." While an admirable improvement objective, the statement is so broad and generic it offers little guidance for either the school's improvement planning team to monitor change or for teachers to inform them of ways to modify their instruction to support the weaknesses students exhibit. Another ELA objective/ priority suggests, "Students need support in applying specific reading strategies to better comprehend fiction and non-fiction writing in order to effectively answer open-response questions and multiple choice questions." This statement can be read as the definition of any effective English language arts program for any school, and does not target the specific problems with the existing practices or programs at Grover Cleveland.

Similar weaknesses exist in the connection between the improvement objectives for mathematics. There is no instructional strategy defined in the school's WSIP that addresses one of the major problems identified by the school, students' omission of responses to the short answer and open response items. There is mention of offering more opportunities for students to write about their mathematical reasoning, but this is a core component of the school's math curriculum, CMP. The 'improvement' objective does not explain how this goal is different from what currently happens in classes or what classroom practices are deficient or poorly implemented.

Without a clearer connection to more fundamental gaps in programs and practices that are contributing to student learning gaps, achievement of the school's improvement objectives will be difficult to measure and will no serve as useful guidance for change.

C. In order to accomplish each improvement objective, does the plan specify strategies which appear likely to lead to improved student results?

No. The improvement strategies listed in the Cleveland WSIP are derived primarily from the school's instructional program, Reader's and Writer's Workshop and Connected Mathematics, all of which are recognized, research-based programs. While these programs have been in place at the school for sometime, the plan does not target those specific instructional strategies within the adopted program that are responsible for the school's record of poor student achievement.

One of the school's ELA improvement objectives proposes, "Build upon the writing skills of all students with a focus on adequate development of topic and conventions." One of the strategies specified to address this objective declares, "Teachers and students will work on creating a community of learners where all students are encouraged to contribute and cooperation is utilized in a positive manner as with peer conferencing." Another strategy to address the same objective suggests, "In all classes (including content areas subjects), students should be provided with more in-depth instruction in the writing process and practice in utilizing it." Each of these two strategies are worthy targets, but they do not represent any clear distinction between existing practices and improved ones. As such, the plan allows teachers to continue the same work they have been doing which has produced the unsatisfactory results students have achieved. There is insufficient detail in the school's description of existing effective and ineffective instructional practices to allow the WSIP writers to define strategies that are likely to lead to positive change.

Similarly in mathematics, the improvement strategy in the recently constructed "Implementation Benchmarks" document proposes, "Instruction will be focused on building student capacity to see patterns and relationships in mathematics and to both connect and apply them to real world settings." Instruction such as this is an appropriate overarching goal for any middle grades mathematics program. As a strategy that will lead to improved student learning at the Cleveland Middle School, however, the strategy statement is far too broad to guide changes in practice that will likely lead to improved student results. The school indicated that there are surveys of instruction that identify features of classroom practice at Cleveland that are inconsistent with the design of the CMP model. The WSIP does not explain specifically how current practices might change to lead to improved student performance. It offers the suggestion that teachers "place instructional emphasis on the 'explore' component of CMP, where students are required to evaluate their thinking and that of other students" but the plan makes no recommendation how teachers – who should have been implementing this strategy throughout their use of CMP – will become proficient in this instructional method.

D. Are the school's written improvement planning document (s) clear and specific enough to guide their implementation of planned improvement initiatives?

No. The written school improvement plan, 2003-04 WSIP offers insufficient guidance to allow teachers to implement instructional changes that will be likely to lead to improved student performance. It is also lacking specific benchmarks to track progress and realistic timelines for completion of key aspects of the plan.

As indicated in response to question C, the Cleveland WSIP offers few details about changes in instructional practices to guide teachers' implementation of the WSIP improvement strategies. The proposed strategies are derived from current understanding of effective practice in mathematics and English language arts and, as such, do not represent a change from the strategies included in the core academic program at Cleveland, those included in Readers' and Writers' Workshop and Connected Mathematics. Without more precise definition of the specific instructional practices that will target precise student learning gaps, the Cleveland WSIP is not a suitable guide for leading change.

The Cleveland WSIP also lacks sufficient guidance for the plan's monitors to track the progress of the strategies and their impact on student learning. Benchmarks containing target dates have not been established in the WSIP, nor have methods of evaluation been specified to measure overall results of the plan's implementation. Action plans do not contain timelines for the implementation and completion of tasks nor are persons responsible for carrying out the action plans specifically identified in the action plan. Although written action plans have been developed, in some cases the diagnosed student learning problem is not addressed by a corresponding set of corrective actions.

The addition of the Implementation Benchmarks to the 2003-2004 Cleveland Middle School WSIP adds somewhat to the degree of specificity of the school's planning tools. However, the two documents are not yet fully integrated to allow for efficient execution of the improvement plans by all stakeholders.

E. Was the School Improvement Plan developed through a process that will support its successful implementation?

A qualified yes. The school improvement plan was developed through the involvement of representative groups in the school through the cluster teams and the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT). The plan itself lacks sufficient detail in its defined strategies, timelines, and progress checkpoints to lend full confidence of its successful implementation. Parents expressed lack of knowledge of the plan's components or development.

Construction of the Cleveland Whole School Improvement Plan was carried out by a representative group of staff members during spring 2003, including the Instructional Leadership Team, which contains 18 representatives drawn from each of the clusters, grade levels, and content areas, along with the school Site Council. The Instructional Staff Survey and teachers interviews indicate that school staff understand and support their role in implementing the improvement plan. The planning process included review of previous school improvement plans and their effectiveness to reveal what efforts had been tried before. The Implementation

Benchmarks, an addendum to the WSIP developed in November 2003 complements the original WSIP and engaged current staff in its construction. The school support specialist and the school's curriculum coaches were active participants in the completion of the addendum. While the Implementation Benchmarks document begins to specify some strategies for review and evaluation of the plan, the timelines, personnel responsible and guidance for teachers are still insufficient.

A focus group interview with parents of GCMS students indicated that they were not aware of the WSIP. There were parents on the School Site Council who were involved in review of the plan during its construction, but communication with the wider population of parents of students at the school has not been adequate to allow broader participation in either plan construction, evaluation or to engage parents in enacting the plan. Coincidentally, the School Site Council parents were also employees of the school system rather than parent volunteers.

Although the ILT, support staff and the principal are actively engaged in the process of constructing a meaningful improvement plan, they are only at the early stages of probing deeply into the reasons for the learning gaps they uncover. As a result, the Whole School Improvement Plan does not yet fully define clear and specific improvement objectives and detailed strategies that can serve as a meaningful guide for future efforts.

KEY QUESTION 2: ARE THE CONDITIONS IN PLACE FOR THE SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IMPROVEMENT PLAN(S)?

Yes. Despite weakness in the existing plan discussed earlier, observation of instructional practices, interviews with Grover Cleveland Middle School's ILT and individual teachers, and observation of school climate by the panel review team indicate that conditions exist for the successful implementation of an enhanced school improvement plan. Teachers expressed confidence in school leaders and school personnel are aware of and committed to the improvement of student's academic achievement. With an enhanced school improvement plan and focused support form the school district in the planning process, the panel review team concluded that conditions are in place for the successful implementation of a Cleveland improvement plan.

A. Does the school have effective leadership and sound management?

Yes. The panel found that the school's leadership and management is adequate and is supported by a substantial percentage of the school staff. Communication among the many groups who participate in leading the school's activities is clear and allows the distribution of tasks among a wide array of personnel.

The principal enjoys support from the staff as demonstrated by 84 percent of respondents to the instructional staff survey indicating that they agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "Our school principal provides effective leadership to guide and support staff efforts to improve the academic performance of our students." Additionally, communication with school staff is frequent and varied. The principal provides a daily e-mail to staff and implements a school-wide

checklist about desirable characteristics for classroom environments. In an interview conducted by the panel review team, the principal reported that she attempts to conduct observations in classrooms 60-90 minutes each day. She added that much of her time is taken up with management and administrative issues, which impacts her ability to maintain the frequency of her class visits and to provide regular teacher feedback.

Instructional leadership by the principal is complemented with the work of the math and literacy coaches each of whom use the Collaborative Coaching and Learning (CCL) model to work with teachers modeling lessons, sharing lesson feedback, and examining other aspects of instructional practice. In individual and focus group interviews with GCMS faculty, the panel learned that responsibility for instructional monitoring is widely dispersed among members of the staff. Interviews with ILT team members and literacy and math coaches indicate that these leadership groups are enthusiastic and confident in the principal's ability to lead the school.

While staff support is strong, a focus group with parents indicated that communication between the school and parents needs improvement. For example, the school reports that written communications with parents are provided in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Vietnamese and Cape Verdean Creole), but parents reported in a focus group interview that that they were not aware of this. Moreover, these same parents reported being unfamiliar with the school's 2003-04 WSIP. The parents represent an untapped potential source of help in addressing the many challenges the school faces in supporting student needs.

B. Is there evidence that the school's faculty supports the planned improvement efforts?

Yes. In individual interviews with eleven GCMS teachers and a focus group with the school site council, school personnel indicated enthusiastic support for the school improvement plan. Site council members appeared knowledgeable about the plan's content and expressed clarity about the intended goals and strategies contained in the current plan. Specialist teachers reported they understand their responsibility to implement the plan's literacy strategies in their special subject classes, and to integrate math skills as appropriate. Interviews with teachers indicated that they are implementing some aspects of the current plan, including CMP, Writer's Workshop and Reader's Workshop. The quality of program implementation is an open question, however, given the poor performance of students during previous years during which the programs have been in place.

Additionally, school personnel indicated in interviews that they believed that the strategies contained in the school plan would produce measurable improvements in student performance in both math and ELA. The panel review team is less convinced of the plan's potential for success since the plan does not contain evidence of a comprehensive process for regular review and assessment of instructional practice, and further noted that the planned observation of classroom instruction relied heavily on walk-throughs to be conducted by the principal which may be unrealistic given demands on the principal's time.

C. Is the school receiving adequate guidance and support from the district leadership?

No. Interviews with Deputy Superintendent indicated that although the school district is aware of the school's learning needs and is cognizant of the WSIP, the Deputy Superintendent acknowledged that support for the 2003-04 WSIP planning process had been insufficient. An interview with the school's principal further indicated that there had been ambiguity about the availability of, and access to, district resources for implementing the school improvement plan.

In order to complete the 2003-04 WSIP, the school wanted additional support in data analysis and contracted independently with a consultant to provide data analysis assistance. According to school personnel, the contractor's services were critical to the analysis of student performance data, though limited in scope. The deputy superintendent reported that she understands the school's needs for additional support for data analysis, which she said would be forthcoming from the district. Last year's gap in district data analysis services were the result of limitations in funding.

The district maintains responsibility for review of the Cleveland WSIP during its construction and partial responsibility for oversight of the plan's implementation. The deputy superintendent approved the school's plan despite her belief that the plan was less than perfect. The deputy superintendent also indicated that she conducts occasional "walk-throughs" (3 times per year) of the school to monitor adherence to the academic models (Reader's and Writer's Workshop and CMP math). As reported by the deputy and by school leaders, there is no formal district process for monitoring the implementation of the specific strategies listed in the school's improvement plan beyond the academic program implementation model. Additional monitoring is the responsibility of the math and literacy coaches who report school progress to district leaders periodically.

A particular challenge for Cleveland cited by the deputy is the consistent delivery of the district curriculum in the substantially separate special education classrooms located at Cleveland. Efforts to examine in greater detail the instructional program and precise learning gaps for students in these settings is an essential support for Cleveland of which the district is aware.

CONCLUSION

The Grover Cleveland Middle School leaders and staff have begun to develop a process for using data to identify student weakness and a plan for ways to address them. The 2003-04 WSIP, however, lacks some key elements of a sound plan – most notably, clear and logical connections between root causes for persistently low student achievement, a set of specific instructional strategies to address them, and clear and measurable objectives for changing instruction and improving student learning.

The panel's finding is that, with adequate additional support, with deeper causal analysis and with specific teacher-focused instructional strategies and student-focused learning objectives, many of the conditions are in place to implement an enhanced version of the current plan,

including solid leadership and staff willingness to work together to achieve the needed improvements.

APPENDIX A
Team Members

Joe Trunk, Panel Chairperson, consultant for SchoolWorks, Beverly, MA.

Brad Rose, Ph.D., Panel Co-Chair, consultant for SchoolWorks, Beverly,MA.

Denise Delorey, Ph.D., Panel Coordinator, Massachusetts Department of Education

Steven Lamarche, Assistant Principal, Bourne Middle School

Sal Camarata, Principal, Garfield Community Magnet School, Revere Public Schools

Jaye Ellen Warry, Executive Director of Curriculum, Lynn Public Schools

Jane Macdonald, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, Sandwich Public Schools

Earl Metzler, Principal, Sterling Middle School, Quincy

APPENDIX B
UNDER-PERFORMING PANEL REVIEW SCHEDULE
Detailed Schedule for Review Panel School Site Visit

The times specified on the following schedule may be adjusted slightly to align with the daily schedule and practices in each of the schools being reviewed.

Day 1

10:30—12:00 Panel chairperson and panel coordinator meet to discuss and clarify roles, prepare for the first team meeting, and review general logistics/schedule for the review. [location: hotel]

12:00—2:00 p.m. **Team meeting # 1**: team meets for the first time to discuss each panelist's individual analysis; team forms preliminary judgements on key questions. [location: hotel]

2:00—3:00 p.m. Panelists meet with the district Superintendent (and Assistant Superintendent, if appropriate). [location: hotel]

3:30—4:30 p.m. Panelists meet with Principal (and one other school-based individual, if appropriate). [location: the school]

6:00—8:00 p.m. **Team meeting # 2**: panelists synthesize interview information, further define findings, prepare questions, and develop a team strategy for Day 2 of the review. [location: hotel]

Day 2

All activities take place in the school

7:30—8:00 a.m. Panelists meet with the Principal

8:00—8:30 a.m. Panelists meet with the School Council

8:30—9:00 a.m. Panelists meet with Focus Groups. The Panel Review Coordinator and the Principal will identify participants for each Focus Group. The groups will be organized, as appropriate, to include groups of individuals who can respond to questions designed for parents, students, classroom teachers, curriculum facilitators, content-area specialists, grade-level instructors, or other specific inquiry groups.

Panelist A	Panelist B	Panelist C	Panelist D	Panelist E
Focus Group	Focus Group	Focus Group	Focus Group	Focus Group

9:00—11:00 a.m. Classroom observations and teacher interviews*

	Panelist A	Panelist B	Panelist C	Panelist D	Panelist E
9-10 a.m.	Observe teacher 1 and teacher 2	Observe teacher 3 and teacher 4	Observe teacher 5 and teacher 6	Observe teacher 7 and teacher 8	Observe teacher 9 and teacher 10
10-11 a.m.	Interview teacher 1 and teacher 2 individually	Interview teacher 3 and teacher 4 individually	Interview teacher 5 and teacher 6 individually	Interview teacher 7 and teacher 8 individually	Interview teacher 9 and teacher 10 individually

11 a.m.—12:30 p.m. **Team meeting # 3**: panelists meet to discuss findings so far and to plan the remainder of the day (working lunch)

12:30—1:00 p.m. Panelists use time as needed to analyze findings and to gather more information; panelists are encouraged to roam the entire school and visit classrooms not yet seen.

1:00—2:00 p.m. Panelists meet with teachers in groups*; consultant co-chair is free to work on report

	Panelist A	Panelist B	Panelist C	Panelist D	Panelist E
1:00-1:30	Teacher	Focus Group 1	Teacher	Focus Group 3	Prepare report
1:30-2:00	Teacher	Focus Group 2	Teacher	Focus Group 4	

2:00—2:30 p.m. Closing meeting with the principal to discuss next steps (all panelists are present)

2:30—5:00 p.m. **Team meeting # 4**: panelists deliberate and form conclusions

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 05690 0432